

## News Analysis

ough citizens really want gambling legalized in Utah, it will eventually happen. That would be lamentable, but participatory democracy doesn't come without wars.

Gambling has not been the promised panacea in many places where it has been legalized. Some figures indicate Atlantic City, N.J. may have actually spent more on increased police protection and social services necessitated by gambling than the city has realized from the gambling "windfall."

Lotteries can easily become a cruel tax because poor people will sometimes spend their food money on a desperate and futile grab for the brass ring.

Utahns need tax relief, but gambling is not the answer. Each member of the predominantly Mormon Legislature will have to search their own conscience and factor in their religious beliefs when they consider the gambling bills. There is nothing wrong with that. It is not anti-American. It is, in fact, the way things should work.

Separation of church and state simply means the "state" will not establish a state church with mandatory membership for all. It does not mean churches should not try to influence their members. What good is a church which does not try to influence its members?

To expect any church to remain neutral on moral issues is silly and it is wrong.

The current system cannot be fixed by growing more money at it. A free market system of parents choosing where their children go to school, whether to a private, religious or public school would create a dynamic atmosphere of competition that would uncover the best methods of teaching and benefit all children. Children in the public schools would especially benefit because public schools would have to match the quality of the private schools. If they did not, parents would hold them accountable and promptly turn to a private school. Private schools would spring up everywhere in response to this need. And since private schools cost about half as much per student as public schools, taxpayers would save money.

So why does the PTA oppose educational vouchers? We believe it is because they are following the NEA's agenda. The public

IF  
GORBY  
ACCEPTS  
AN  
ACADEMIC  
JOB...

© 1992 MELISSA CORLEY NEWS SERVICE

PROF.  
GORBACHEV

JUST WHAT DO YOU MEAN--  
HE MIGHT NOT BE THE BEST  
PERSON TO WRITE MY BUSINESS  
SCHOOL RECOMMENDATION?

## The delights of selective tolerance

Hannah Arendt wrote that Nazi mass-murderer Adolf Eichmann represented the "banality of evil." America's Opinion Cartel would have Americans believe that wherever Patrick Buchanan goes, he casts the vile shadow of Auschwitz. The presidential candidate, we are asked to believe, embodies what could be called the "gentility of evil."

Time magazine has warned its readers that "Like many ultraconservatives, Buchanan is unfailingly kind and generous to people regardless of their background. But he can be just as cruel to the groups to which they belong." Even Buchanan's innate courtesy is to be taken in evidence against him. The enduring indictment against liberalism — which is fortified by Time's criticism of Buchanan — is that liberals, while professing abundant love for humanity, have no particular affection for individual people. Buchanan, who respects people individually, is utterly unintelligible to those who believe that the worth of an individual is a function of his political affiliations.

Commentator Christopher Matthews has written indignantly that "(Buchanan) opposes foreign aid. Why? Because (he believes) we should spend the money on ourselves." When did this become a controversial proposition?

Matthews has described Buchanan as an advocate of "mindless tribalism." Eleanor Clift of Newsweek once dismissed Buchanan as "David Duke with a word processor." Matthews disputed that characterization, as "it suggests, unfortunately, that Mr. Buchanan operates on a higher level than his Louisiana co-Republican."



Will  
Grigg

AT HOME  
AND ABROAD

According to Matthews, Buchanan is not only intolerant and illiterate, he is un-American: "His words ... are those of someone who questions at the deepest level those very ideals for which our great ongoing American Revolution has been fought these past 200 years." This is not an accusation to be made lightly — and, under the prevailing standards of "fairness," it is one that can be made only by a commentator on the Left.

Buchanan has written critically of aid to Israel and Israeli policies on the West Bank; he supports the creation of a demilitarized Palestinian state. Many of his critics, who can abide such opinions when voiced by others, insist that Buchanan is un-American. Buchanan has stated that Israel is entitled to peace, to security, to recognition, to a lifting of the Arab embargo, and to a repeal of the "revolting" U.N. Zionism-equals-racism resolution. He has said that Jewish Americans are entitled full rights, political participation and protection against anti-Semitic quotas. He has never questioned the historic reality of the Holocaust. Yet his detractors insist that, at some level discernible only to

the properly enlightened, Buchanan is an incorrigible anti-Semite.

Buchanan is an unapologetic Catholic; accordingly, it is noteworthy that one of his critics has accused him of running an "anti-Catholic campaign." Writing for the religious news service, Eugene Kennedy has explained that "The word 'catholic' means universal," and that Buchanan's nationalist platform would tempt "the richly blessed United States to turn aside from its calling to share its boons with others."

Kennedy has instructed Catholics not to believe that Buchanan's views "are ... anything remotely like what the Catholic Church, even in its historical authoritarian worst, has ever believed or taught." Kennedy mangles the point. At its "historical, authoritarian worst," the Catholic Church, in alliance with corrupt, tyrannical civil authorities, enforced a universal order that stifled freedom and diversity. By rebelling against the "New World Order," Buchanan is seeking to avoid a descent into a similar "universal" order predicated upon secular, rather than religious, dogmas.

Kennedy's article literally anathematizes Buchanan: "The tracts and tones of Buchanan's campaign are incompatible with the teachings of Jesus Christ." Buchanan, we are urged to believe, is un-American and anti-Christ. During the last decade, such language (when used by right-wing preachers) was considered symptomatic of incipient fascism; now the Left freely avails itself of such language in its campaign to vilify Buchanan. Isn't "tolerance" delightful?